No D. 4373—*C. S.* 14-38-14, *dated Bangalore, 14th November* 1938.

In exercise of the powers vested in them under Section 44 (2) (g) of the Mysore Co-operative Societies Act of 1918, as amended from time to time, the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore are pleased to make the following rule prohibiting a person from serving on the Committee of Management more than one Co-operative Society of the same type.—

"6 (*d*) No person shall serve simultaneously on the Committee of Management of more than one Society of the same type without the special or general sanction of the Registrar."

N. B.—The decision of the Registrar as to whether two or more Societies are of the same type or not shall be final.

By Order,
P. H. KRISHNA RAO,
Secretary to Government,
Local Self-Government Department.

No. L. C.—966, *dated Bangalore, the 7th November* 1938.

Under Rule 8 of the rules for the conduct of business of the Mysore Legislative Council, the accompanying Bill further to amend the Mysore Limitation Act, 1911 is published for general information with the statement of objects and reasons.

By Order,
A. SUNDARARAJA RAO,
Secretary,
Mysore Legislative Council.

Bill further to amend the Mysore Limitation Act, 1911.

Whereas it is expedient further to amend the Mysore Limitation Act, 1911: It is hereby enacted as follows:—

In the first column of Article 11 of the First Schedule to the Mysore Limitation Act, 1911, omit the

words "after an investigation of" and substitute the word "on" in their place.

Statement of objects and reasons.

In British India a suit by a person against whom an order has been made under the Code of the Civil Procedure on a claim preferred to or an objection made to the attachment of property attached in execution of a decree is one year from the date of the order whether the order in question was passed after investigation or not. But in Mysore a difference exists between an order passed after an investigation and an order passed without investigation. It the case of the former the short period of limitation prescribed under Article 11 applies whereas the usual period of limitation for establishing title to property, *viz.*, 12 years applies in the case of the latter. From this it is seen that the orders in cases of claims or objections, where there was investigation, became conclusive after one year, if no suit was filed to set aside such an order by the unsuccessful party whereas in the other case, where there was no investigation, the order was not conclusive at all.

A claimant or objector who puts forward his claim or objection and interferes with execution proceedings and then does not take step to have his claim investigated is in a better position than the one who gets his claim investigated. Very often the claimants will be acting on behalf of the judgment-debtor to impede the progress in the realisation of the decree amount. There is no reason to treat the two claimants differently. In British India both kinds of claimants are treated alike, whether there is any investigation or not. In such a proceeding, the unsuccessful party has to bring a suit within one year from the date of the order. It is now proposed to amend Article 11 of the Limitation Act to bring it on a line with the law in British India and to omit the distinction now existing. It is also convenient that our law should be similar to British India law as far as possible.